Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Recd.	1914.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O. No. 508 I., 9th October 1914.

The Notes
in this G.O. have been printed.

Modifications of grants under the head "49"

Sanctioning with remarks certain —.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Recd.	} 1914.	*Enclosures*	
Regd		*Spare copies*	

G.O. No. 508 I., 9th October 1914.

N. P.

Modifications of grants under the head "49"

Sanctioning with remarks certain —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

From the Superintending Engineer,			V	Circle No.	268 E.I., dated 4th August 1914.
To	,,	,,	V	,,	4562/14-B-1, dated 12th August 1914.
From	,,	,,	VI	,,	1204 C.E., dated 28th August 1914.
From	,,	,,	I	,,	594 C., dated 2nd September 1914.
From	,,	,,	VII	,,	637 E.I., dated 4th September 1914.
From	,,	,,	V	,,	320 E.I., dated 8th September, 1914. (reply to reminder, dated 4th September 1914).
From	,,	,,	V	,,	322 E.I., dated 9th September 1914.

Order—No. 508 I., dated 9th October 1914.

The papers read above relate to certain modifications of grants under the head "49. Capital expenditure not charged to revenue" which are consolidated in the appended statement. The reasons for the modifications are explained in the remarks column of the statement. The surrenders proposed amount to Rs. 62,514 as shown in column 5 of the appendix. After a demand amounting to Rs. 12,514 is met from these surrenders, there is a balance of Rs. 50,000, which will be kept in reserve, pending decision of the question of the head of account to which the reconstruction of the Bezwada headsluice and river wall is chargeable, which is separately under consideration.

(True Extract.)

W. M. ELLIS, Col., R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.
(Irrigation Branch).

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineers, I, V, VI, and VII Circles.
,, Accountant-General, Madras.
,, Financial Department.

[Appendix.

Appendix to G.O. No. 508 I., dated 9th October 1914.

STATEMENT showing surrenders and demands made by Superintending Engineers under the head "49. Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue."

Item number.	Division.	Fund head and name of work or system.	Surrenders.		Demands.		Remarks.
			Proposed by Superintending Engineers.	Accepted by Government.	Proposed by Superintending Engineers.	Sanctioned by Government.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		IMPERIAL. IRRIGATION. *49. Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue.*					
		Godavari Delta system—					
1	Godavari Conservancy.	Diverting the Vasista left bank at Sakhinetipalli from 49 miles 4 furlongs 537 feet to 49 miles 5 furlongs 180 feet.	..	..	10,300	10,300	*Item* 1.—The estimate for this work was in the first instance proposed to be sanctioned under "43.—Agricultural Works," and necessary provision was accordingly made in the budget estimate for 1914–15. The estimate having since been sanctioned under the head "49", with reference to the principles laid down in Official Memorandum No. 1039 C., dated 6th February 1914, the grant required for expenditure is now applied for under the latter head.
2	Do. ..	Diverting the Sakhinetipalli weir channel.	1,540	1,540	..	..	*Item* 2.—A sum of Rupees 5,800, representing the amount of the estimate for the work as submitted by the Superintending Engineer, was provided in the current year's budget. As the estimate was since reduced and sanctioned by Government for Rs. 4,260, the difference is now proposed for surrender.
		Total works ..	1,540	1,540	10,300	10,300	
		Establishment ..	331	331	2,214	2,214	
		Total Godāvari Delta system	1,871	1,871	12,514	12,514	
		Penner river canals system—					
3	Nellore ..	Improvements to Uyyalakalva and its distributary channels.	5,000	5,000	..	..	*Item* 3.—The estimate for this work first submitted by the Superintending Engineer, was returned to him for revision and resubmission. The receipt of the estimate is awaited. As the whole grant of Rupees 10,119 made in the budget estimate for 1914–15 is not likely to be spent, a portion thereof, viz. Rs. 5,000 is surrendered.
		Establishment ..	1,075	1,075	..	..	
		Total Penner river canals system.	6,075	6,075	..	..	
4	North Arcot ..	Cheyar anicut system—Improvements to the Molagiripattu and Kadagampundi tanks.	5,000	5,000	..	..	*Item* 4.—It is stated that the estimate for the work is being revised in the division office, and that there is no probability of getting the revised estimate sanctioned in time during the current year. Hence the surrender.
5	Do. ..	Improving the road dam at the Cheyar anicut, and constructing a 1,000 feet natural escape at the left flood bank of the anicut.	3,000	3,000	..	..	*Item* 5.—The estimate for the work having been sanctioned only in June 1914, it is stated that the whole amount of Rs. 8,000 provided in the budget cannot be spent within the current year. A portion of the budget grant is therefore surrendered.
		Total ..	8,000	8,000	..	..	
		Establishment ..	1,720	1,720	..	..	
		Total Cheyar anicut system.	9,720	9,720	..	..	

Statement showing surrenders and demands made by Superintending Engineers under the head "49. Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue"—*cont.*

Item number.	Division.	Fund head and name of work or system.	Surrenders.		Demands.		Remarks.
			Proposed by Superintending Engineers.	Accepted by Government.	Proposed by Superintending Engineers.	Sanctioned by Government.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		IMPERIAL—*cont.*	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	
		IRRIGATION—*cont.*					
		49. *Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue*—cont.					
6	Cauvery ..	Cauvery Delta system—Improvements to the Cauvery - Vennar regulators.	10,000	10,000	..	..	*Item* 6.—The grant for this work was made in the hope that the estimate for it would be sanctioned for execution during the year. As it has since been decided to make a further examination of the foundations, which cannot be done until January or February next, the Government of India has been informed that the estimate will be submitted for sanction only in April 1915. In these circumstances the budget grant for the work is surrendered.
7	Do. ..	Improvements to the Cauvery from the Mayavaram bridge to the sea.	4,110	4,110	..	..	*Item* 7.—As there is no probability of getting the estimate for this work sanctioned in time for execution during the current year, a sum of Rs. 15,890 was resumed from the grant for this work and re-appropriated to other works—*vide* G.O. No. 371 I., dated 1st August 1914. The balance is now surrendered.
8	Do. ..	Improvements to the Vellapallam Uppanar.	2,000	2,578	..	..	*Item* 8.—The land required for the work having just been handed over, the amount that can be utilised during the current year has been reserved, and the balance of the budget grant is surrendered.
9	Do. ..	Improvements to the leading channel of the Kangayen head sluice, Cauvery left bank, 53/1 and 2 miles.	700	700	..	..	*Item* 9.—The land required for this work has not yet been handed over to this Department. In Official Memorandum No. 1331-B./14-1, dated 14th July 1914, the Collector of Tanjore has been asked to expedite the acquisition proceedings. The amount required for meeting land compensation only has been reserved and the balance of the budget grant is surrendered.
		Total works ..	16,810	17,388	..	..	
		Establishment ..	3,614	3,738	..	..	
		Total, Cauvery Delta system.	20,424	21,126	..	..	
10	Madura ..	Periyar system—Works	19,524	19,524	..	..	*Item* 10.—This amount is made up of (1) Rs. 11,000 surrendered from the grant of Rs. 20,000 for the work "Improvements to Peranai Regulators and (2) Rs. 8,524 from the grant for other works in the Periyar system. As regards (1) it is stated that the Superintendent, Public Works Workshops, expects to debit during the current year only Rs. 4,500 on account of value of shutters required for the work, and that another sum of Rs. 4,500 will be spent on the Railway freight of shutters and on construction work at site. In regard to (2) the surrender is reported to be due to difficulties experienced in procuring labour and to want of reliable contractors.
		Establishment ..	4,198	4,198	..	..	
		Total, Periyar system ..	23,722	23,722	..	..	
		Reserve—Works	..	..	..	41,152	
		Establishment ..	..	..	..	8,848	
		Total ..	..	..	..	50,000	
		Grand total ..	61,812	62,514	12,514	62,514	

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 508 I., DATED 9TH OCTOBER 1914.

[SUBJECT.—*Modifications of grants under the head* "49. *Capital Expenditure not charged to Revenue.*"

From the Suptg. Engineer,	*V Circle,*	*dated*	*4th August*	1914,	*No.*	268 *E.I.*	
To ,, ,,	*V* ,,	,,	*12th* ,,	,,	,,	4562/14-*B.*-1.	
From ,, ,,	*VI* ,,	,,	*28th* ,,	,,	,,	1204 *C.E.*	
,, ,, ,,	*I* ,,	,,	*2nd September*	1914,	*No.*	594 *C.*	
,, ,, ,,	*VII* ,,	,,	*4th* ,,	,,	,,	637 *E.I.*	
,, ,, ,,	*V* ,,	,,	*8th* ,,	,,	,,	320 ,,	*(reply to reminder, dated 4th September 1914).*
,, ,, ,,	*V* ,,	,,	*9th* ,,	,,	,,	322 *E.I.*	

Under Secretary—
Joint Secretary—

The modifications proposed result in a net surrender of Rs. 50,000. There is no demand to enable this surrender to be utilised. A draft order relinquishing the amount to the Government of India is therefore submitted for approval. It may be forwarded to Financial for acceptance before circulation to the Honourable Member.

2. As the proposal involves no modifications of grant relating to projects under construction, it is unnecessary to send a copy of the proceedings to the Government of India—*vide* G.O. No. 290 I., dated 20th May 1913.

3. With reference to Memorandum No. 4562/14 B-1., dated 12th August 1914, the Superintending Engineer explains in paragraph 2 of his letter, dated 9th September 1914, why the surrender of Rs. 5,000 in respect of the marginally noted work was not taken into consideration when the statement of demands for incomplete works under "49" was submitted. The explanation may, it is submitted, be accepted.

Improvements to the Uyyalakalva and its distributary channels, Penner river canals system.

Disposed of in G.O. No. 371 I., dated 1st August 1914.

T.S.R.—10-9-14.
M.S.V.—10-9-14.

F. E. MORGAN—11-9-14.
W. M. ELLIS—12-9-14.

To Financial Department u.o.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

The Public Works Department (Irrigation) propose to surrender to India ·50 lakh from the budget allotment under the *Imperial* head "49. IRRIGATION—CAPITAL EXPENDITURE NOT CHARGED TO REVENUE." It is stated that there is no demand to enable this surrender to be utilised.

2. The draft may, it is submitted, be accepted.

V.V.—16-9-14.
A.H.—16-9-14.

B. L. A. LAVILLE—17-9-14.

To Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

Public Works Department
(Irrigation Branch).

Under Secretary—
Joint Secretary—

The case may be circulated to the Honourable Member.

A.V.S.—18-9-14.

F.E.M.—18-9-14.

Honourable Member—

W.M.E.—18-9-14.

Shall we not want funds for Bezwada? If so, is it wise to surrender ·50?

H. A. S[tuart]—19-9-14

Secretary—

Honourable Member evidently refers to the re-construction of the Bezwada head sluice. Under Public Works Code, paragraph 1921, as reconstructed in Standing Order No. 123, dated 7th September 1911, a renewal, which does not represent a substantial improvement of the original work, but which is in all material essentials the same as the old work, has to be charged to the Revenue and not to the Capital account of the system. In this connection reference is solicited to letter No. 848 I., dated 12th June 1913, from the Government of India returning the estimate for re-constructing the lock at Vizeswaram, Gōdāvari delta, for sanction under "42" instead of under "49" as recommended by this Government.

The question is discussed in the notes at pages 2 and 3 of Notes to G.O. No. 379 I., dated 1st July 1913, perusal of which is requested. In the case of the Bezwada head sluice it seems certain that there will be nothing in the new sluice to be constructed which will add to the capital value of the delta. The cost of the work will therefore have to be debited to the revenue account of the system, *i.e.*, to the divided head 42. Major Works—Working Expenses. The proposed surrender to India of ·50 lakh under "49"—Imperial may, it is submitted, be made.

A.V.S.—23-9-14.

Secretary—

It seems certain that the Government of India will rule that the cost of reconstruction of the Bezwada head sulice be charged to 42, as judging from their decision in the case of the Vizeswaram lock the cost cannot be charged to "49" unless increased waterway is given which is, I think, not contemplated.

When the correction slip to paragraph 1921 was issued by the Government of India the ruling contained in it was not contested, as it was not contemplated that the Government of India would interpret it in the way they have done in the case of Vizeswaram lock.

The decision in the case of the lock, though not contested by this Government, is clearly wrong as the new lock has added to the capital value of the system, is a substantial improvement of the original work and is not in all material essentials the same as the old one.

The new lock was designed to resist the forces that destroyed the old one and also other possible conditions that the old one could not resist; if the old work had been so designed it would have cost far more than it actually did and far more than the sum now entered in the accounts as the capital value of the new lock; it is therefore submitted that the new work does increase the capital value of the system.

It is also submitted that a new work that will not fail under the conditions that caused the failure of the work, which it replaces, must be a substantial improvement on it and cannot therefore be in all material essentials the same.

The most material point in an irrigation work is that it shall be stable but the Government of India by their ruling apparently do not regard stability as a "material essential".

If the Bezwada headsluice is reconstructed in its present site, then the superstructure will not materially differ from that which previously existed and that portion of the work is a fair charge to "42" and the same applies to the reconstruction of the fallen undersluices and any work found necessary to restore the end of the river wall. Any additional protection to the headsluice, over and above what previously existed, is an improvement which is legitimately chargeable to "49."

If therefore the head sluice is reconstructed in its present site, the estimate might be divided into 4:—

(1) Reconstruction of bays 1 to 4 of Bezwada headsluice.
(2) Reconstruction of ? to ? bays of Bezwada undersluices.
(3) Repairs to river wall.
(4) Providing additional protection to Bezwada headsluice and lock channel.

Estimates (1), (2) and (3) are fairly chargeable to "42" and will be within the powers of sanction of the Local Government. Estimate (4) is an improvement chargeable to "49" and will almost certainly exceed the powers of sanction of the Local Government.

If the headsluice is to be reconstructed at the site of the one that existed up to 1904, or further down the canal, then the whole cost of reconstruction should be charged to "49" and the cost of the existing one written back to "42."

The reason for charging the whole cost to "49" is that in either case the new headsluice will be an improvement on the old one, as if it is constructed in the site of that which existed prior to 1904, then it will exclude sand from the canal and render the lock channel safe neither of which objects could be effected by the existing headsluice.

If the headsluice is reconstructed further down the canal, an improvement is effected as that all danger to the river wall, during floods, is eliminated and also any danger of the anicut being turned and the cost seems fairly chargeable to "49."

If the above is accepted then the amount required under "49" will depend on whether the headsluice is constructed at its present or a new site.

If at the present site, Rs. 50,000 to 75,000 will probably be all the funds we want under "49," if at a new site, then we shall probably want Rs. 3 lakhs.

F.E.M.—24-9-14.

The case relates to the proposed surrender to India of 0·50 lakh under Imperial head "49."

From the notes above it is clear that there is ample ground for charging some of the works necessary to reconstruct and secure Bezwada head works to this head.

Under the circumstances it is certainly undesirable to surrender this half lakh and the draft order has been modified and is sent to Financial for acceptance.

The case regarding the funds required for expenditure on the restoration of Bezwada headworks during the current year (from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 lakhs) has been taken up separately in the linked * file.

* C. No. 486-O/14.
C. No. 6433/14.

W.M.E.—25-7-14.

To Financial Department u.o.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Financial Department notes on page 1 *ante et. seq.* The Public Works Department (Irrigation Branch) now propose to keep the sum of ·50 lakh in reserve instead of surrendering it to India, on account of the expenditure anticipated on the Bezwada headsluice.

2. Attention is solicited to the notes in the linked † file. It seems likely that some time will elapse before the work of Bezwada headsluice can be ready to require allotment of funds. It is for consideration whether the present sum of ·50 lakh may not be immediately surrendered

† C. No. 486-O./14.
C. No. 6433/14.

to India with the remark that funds will be required for the Bezwada head works and will be applied for later on.

V.V.—30-9-14

A.H.—30-9-14.

Chief Secretary—

Apparently it has yet to be decided where the Bezwada headsluice is to be reconstructed. When a decision is come to on that point, it appears that it will be necessary to obtain the sanction of the Government of India to start the work which will be required whether the reconstruction is carried out on the present site or on one of the two alternative new sites, as the cost in either case will exceed the limit of sanction of the Local Government. This will take some time and it hardly seems necessary to hold on to the ·50 lakh available for surrender to the Government of India under the head "49—Capital expenditure not charged to revenue." Please see in this connection paragraph 1884 of the Public Works Department Code, Volume II. But if Public Works Department are convinced that there is time yet to spend the money on the works in question before the close of the current year, Financial need not object to the draft order proposed.

B.L.A.L.—1-10-14.

I agree with Assistant Secretary that in view of paragraph 1884, Public Works Code, surrender should be made unless the Public Works Department are satisfied that outlay of ·50 debitable to head "49" can be made during the current year.

A.B.—2-10-14.

To Public Works Department (Irrigation) u.o.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(IRRIGATION BRANCH).

Under Secretary—
Joint Secretary—

Submitted for orders.

A.V.S.—2-10-14.

It is certain that the ·50 lakh can be spent before the end of the financial year. Materials are now being collected.

F. E. MORGAN—3-10-14.

Honourable Member—

Yes—there is no doubt of over ·50 lakh being spent during the current year on restoration of the Bezwada headworks.

Under these conditions Financial have accepted the draft order which is sent to Honourable Member for acceptance. The linked* file should be consulted in this connection.

* C. No. 486-0/14.
C. No. 6433/14.

W.M.E.—5-10-14.

H. A. S[TUART]—5-10-14.

Issue.

W.M.E.—6-10-14.

[Issued as G.O. No. 508 I., dated 9th October 1914.]

Sectt. II-9—24,002—19-4-13.

P.W. DEPARTMENT. (8)

Modifications of grants under "49".

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

Current No.	From	Number.	Date.	Pages.
C 4562/14	From S. E. V	268 E.I	4-8-14	1+2
	Do -Do-	4562/14-1	12-8-14	3
C 5783(a)/14	From S. E. VI	1204 C.E.	28-8-14	4 to 6
C 5276/14	From S. E. I	594 C	2-9-14	7+8
C 5343/14	From S.E. VII	637 E.I	3-9-14	9 to 11
C 5413/14	Reminder to S.E. V	-	4-9-14	12
C 5413/14	From S.E. V	320 E.I	8-9-14	12
C 5437/14	From S.E. V	322 E.I	9-9-14	13 to 15

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No.

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (= S.C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers as have been removed for copying, printing, etc., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number	Date.	Original (= O.) or spare copy (= S. C).	Initials with date of (1) Referencer acknowledging returns of the paper concerned or (2) Despatcher to denote the return of the papers to the department concerned

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code,

Vol. II, para. 1876 (h).

1. This form should be used by the Executive Engineer in any of the following cases :—

(a).—When he requires a grant, or an addition to an existing grant, for carrying on a sanctioned major work.

(b).—When he is unable to utilize the grant at his disposal for any work, and wishes to resign it either wholly or in part.

(c).—When he wishes to utilize the grant for one work upon some ot[illegible]

2. Either of the columns for "Proposed new grant" or for "Proposed reduction," or both, may be used as required.

3. If it happens that the grant already allowed has been reduced, the entry in the column "Existing grant for current year," would of course be the amount less such reduction.

4. In the case of Irrigation works, the entries in the column "Departmental and service head" should show distinctly whether the proposed re-appropriation is debitable to Capital or Revenue, and the entries in the column "Works" should be so arranged as to show the project to the Capital or Revenue account of which the charge is debitable, and the class of service to which the charge is debitable, thus :—

__________PROJECT.

(1).—HEAD WORKS—

(B). Land.

(K). Buildings.

In cases of Productive public works, the fact of their being so should be noted against the entries.

5. It being of the utmost importance that early intimation of possible lapses, or of excesses in outlay on works should be communicated to the Government, a close watch should be maintained on the progress of all works by Executive Officers, and this form employed the moment the facts are sufficiently known.

6. Applications for re-appropriations which require the sanction of the Government of India should be submitted by the local Government in duplicate; applications by Executive Engineers should be submitted through the Superintending Engineers of their Circles.

EXPLANATION OF NECESSITY FOR RE-APPROPRIATION.

As the estimate has not yet been sanctioned there is no probability of [illegible] whole grant being spent. Hence Rs 5000 is surrendered.

[signature]
3-8-14
Superintending Engineer
V circle

[initials] 3-8-14 [initials] 3.8.14.

P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

Madras PROVINCE.

BRANCH— Irrigation

CIRCLE— Fifth

DIVISION— Nellore.

FUND— 49. Imperial Irrigation

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
4 - AUG 1914
No. 4562/14 - B

Application for a re-appropriation of Budget grants. for 1914-15

*No.*______, *dated the*__________191 .

*No.*______, *dated the*__________191 .

P. W. D. Form No. 41H

Application to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for a re-appropriation of Budget grants. for 1914-15

Proposed new grant.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed increase.	Grant as now proposed.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

Proposed reduction.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed reduction.	Amount at which grant for work will stand after reduction.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
49. Imperial Irrigation		49. Imperial Irrigation Pennar River Canal System.						
		1. Improvements to Uyyalakalva and its distributing channels.	about Rs 11500	-	10019	10019	5000	5019

Orders by the Government of ________

No. 268EI dated the 4th August 1914

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

[illegible] 5.8.14

(Signature) Superintending Engineer I Circle

Secy. to Government of ________ P. W. Department.

No. ______ dated the ______ 191 .

[illegible] 3.8.14. [illegible] 3.8.14

E. I's Office

No. 4562/14-B-1 dy 12.8.14

Memo.

With reference to his Endorsement No. 268 E.I dy 4-8-14 proposing a surrender of Rs 5,000 under "49" from the grant for "Impts: to Eyyalakalva and its distributary channels", Pennar river Canals System the Supg: Engineer, I circle, is requested to state whether the above amount includes land compensation charges ~~also~~ and if so how much. ~~He is~~ It should also be ~~requested~~ ~~to~~ stated why the above sum was not taken into consideration when the statement of demands for incomplete works under "49" was submitted.

[signature] 12.8.14 — [initials] 12/8

To
The Supg: Engineer
I circle.

Ch No 4562/14

P.P. H27 C/5

To be reminded after 3 weeks.

To Re to note
[initials]
13-8-14

[initials] 13.8.14

Reminder

[initials] 4.9.14

Remr

DESPATCHED
Date 4.9.1914
Enclos. —

(Vide l.f. C No 4536/14)

[initials] 10/8

DESPATCHED
Date 12.8.1914
Enclos. —

[initials] 12.8.14

P. W. D. Form No. 41H

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code

Vol. II, para. 1876 (h).

1. This form should be used by the Executive Engineer in any of the following cases:—

(*a*).—When he requires a grant or an addition to an existing grant, for carrying on a sanctioned major work.

(*b*).—When he is unable to utilize the grant at his disposal for any work, and wishes to resign it either wholly or in part.

(*c*).—When he wishes to utilize the grant for one work upon son[illegible]her.

2. Either of the columns for "Proposed new grant" or for "Proposed reduction," or both, may be used as required.

3. If it happens that the grant already allowed has been reduced, the entry in the column "Existing grant for current year, would of course be the amount less such reduction.

4. In the case of Irrigation works, the entries in the column "Departmental and service head" should show distinctly whether the proposed re-appropriation is debitable to Capital or Revenue, and the entries in the column "Works" should be so arranged as to show the project to the Capital or Revenue account of which the charge is debitable, and the class of service to which the charge is debitable, thus:—

——————PROJECT.

(1).—HEAD WORKS—

(*K*). Land

(*B*). Buildings

In cases of Productive public works, the fact of their being so should be noted against the entries.

5. It being of the utmost importance that early intimation of possible lapses, or of excesses in outlay on works should be communicated to the Government, a close watch should be maintained on the progress of all works by Executive Officers, and this form employed the moment the facts are sufficiently known.

6. Applications for re-appropriations which require the sanction of the Government of India should be submitted by the local Government in duplicate; applications by Executive Engineers should be submitted through the Superintending Engineers of their Circles.

Madras PROVINCE.

BRANCH— Buildings and Roads.

CIRCLE— Ziste.

DIVISION— Madura.

FUND— 49. Capital Irrigation

4562/14 CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 31 AUG 1914 No. 518 3/14-B (a)

Application for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

No.————, *dated the*——————190

No. 1204 CE, *dated the* 28th Augst 1914

Copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation with the request that in the circumstances explained the surrender may be recommended to Government for sanction.

G. Krishnaswami ?
27 ?
for Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

? 27.8.14.

Belvedere Steam Printing Works, Allahabad.—35 VII 09

P. W. D. Form No. 41H. 5 P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

Application to the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, Trichinopoly, for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

PROPOSED INCREASES.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed increase.	Grant as now proposed.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed reduction.	Amount at which grant for work will stand after reduction.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
		49 Capital						
49 Capital.		Lump Sum. —	-	-	58524	58,524	19,524	39,000.

Orders by the Government of ....

No. ...... dated the ...... 190 .

Secy. to Govt. of ....

P. W. Department.

Forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, for favour of approval.

No. ...... dated the 190

Sd/- M. O'Brien,
Ex: Engineer, Madura Dn.

(True copy)

(Signature) ....

6

P. W. D. FORM No. 41H.

EXPLANATION OF NECESSITY FOR RE-APPROPRIATION.

(1). A grant of Rs. 20,000/- has been allotted in the budget for the work of raising the platform altering the gearing and roller arrangements and shifting the bridge of Peranai Regulator estimate Rs. 62,300/-. But the Superintendent, P.W.Workshops states that he will debit only Rs. 4,500 in the current year on account of value of shutters &c., to be supplied to the work. Taking Rs. 2,000/- approximately for railway freight on the above shutters, and Rs. 1,000/- for cost of masonry and erection and also Rs. 1,500/- for wood already ordered for the bridge, the probable outlay during the year against this grant of Rs. 20,000/- comes to Rs. 9,000/- only. Hence a sum of Rs. 11,000 out of this grant is surrendered.

(2). The grant for other works under 49 Capital in this Division -- amounts to Rs. 38,524/-. As this amount cannot be spent in full owing to difficulties with labour and want of reliable contractors a sum of Rs. 8,524/- out of this grant is surrendered. Hence the total surrender of Rs. 19,524/-.

sd/:- M.O'Brien,
Executive Engineer, Madura Dn.

(By order)
Sd/:- M.Ramaswami Ayyar,
For Executive Engineer.

(True copy)

Gd
[illegible]

7

CE 5614

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 3 SEP 1914 No. 5276/14 - B.

P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code,

Vol. II, para. 1876 (h).

1. This form should be used by the Executive Engineer in any of the following cases :—

(a).—When he requires a grant, or an addition to an existing grant, for carrying on a sanctioned major work.

(b).—When he is unable to utilize the grant at his disposal for any work, and wishes to resign it either wholly or in part.

(c).—When he wishes to utilize the grant for one work upon some [illegible]r.

2. Either of the columns for "Proposed new grant" or for "Proposed reduction," or both, may be used as required.

3. If it happens that the grant already allowed has been reduced, the entry in the column "Existing grant for current year," would of course be the amount less such reduction.

4. In the case of Irrigation works, the entries in the column "Departmental and service head" should show distinctly whether the proposed re-appropriation is debitable to Capital or Revenue, and the entries in the column "Works" should be so arranged as to show the project to the Capital or Revenue account of which the charge is debitable, and the class of service to which the charge is debitable, thus :—

__________PROJECT.

(1).—Head works—

(B). Land.

(K). Buildings.

In cases of Productive public works, the fact of their being so should be noted against the entries.

5. It being of the utmost importance that early intimation of possible lapses, or of excesses in outlay on works should be communicated to the Government, a close watch should be maintained on the progress of all works by Executive Officers, and this form employed the moment the facts are sufficiently known.

6. Applications for re-appropriations which require the sanction of the Government of India should be submitted by the local Government in duplicate; applications by Executive Engineers should be submitted through the Superintending Engineers of their Circles.

Madras PROVINCE.

BRANCH— Buildings and Roads

CIRCLE— First

DIVISION— Godavari Conservancy

FUND— 49 Capital.

Application for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

*No.*________, *dated the*________ *191* .

No. C 594, *dated the* 2/9/ *191*4.

EXPLANATION OF NECESSITY FOR RE-APPROPRIATION.

(a) The estimate was expected to be sanctioned under 43 Agrl. Irrigl. Works Major. The amount of the estimate as submitted by this office was Rs: 11300. A grant of Rs. 11300 was accordingly obtained under 43 Agricultural. But the estimate was altered to Rs: 10200 & sanctioned under 49 Capital in G.O. No. 325-I dated 7.7.14. The work has already been started & is in progress. Hence the necessity for funds under 49 Capital. Flag H

(b). The estimate was originally submitted for Rs: 5800 & funds were obtained accordingly but the estimate was corrected to Rs: 4260 in G.O. No. 325-I dated 7-7-14. The grant in excess of the sanctioned estimate is now surrendered. Flag H

(Sd) S. Bhaskara Aiyar

Ex: Eng.

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for favour of early sanction.

2. The grant of Rs. 11300 allotted to the work "Diverting the Vasishta left bank at Sakhinetipally under Agricultural Major Works" has been reappropriated to Agricultural repairs.

(Sd.) [illegible]
1 IX. 14

for Superintending Engineer
I Circle.

To Mr. S. Row for papers

(Sd.) 7-9-14

Gulab Singh & Sons, Calcutta—No. 314 P. W. D.—7-3-13—26,000.

P. W. D. Form No. 41 II.

8

Application to the Superintending Engineer I Circle for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

PROPOSED NEW GRANT.									PROPOSED REDUCTION.								
Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed increase.	Grant as now proposed.	Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed reduction.	Amount at which grant for work will stand after reduction.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.				Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
49 Capital		Diverting the vasista left bank at Sokhinetipalli G.O. No 325-I of 7.7.14 C.R. No 275 of 14-15	10300 Flag H	–	–	–	(a) 10300	10300	49 Capital	42	Diverting the Sokhinetipally weir channel Est. Rs. 4260 G.O. No 325-I of 7-7.14. C.R. No 274 of 14.15	4260 Flag H	–	5800	5800	(b) 1540	4260

Orders by the Government of

No. 7875 dated the 25. 8. 1914.

Forwarded to the Supdg. Engineer I Circle.

No. ______ dated the ______ 191 .

Secy. to Government of ______ P. W. Department.

(Sd) Bhaskaraiyer 25.8.14

(Signature) Executive Engineer. G. D. D.

Custody

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
5 SEP 1914
No. 5343/4—B

9

P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code.

Vol. II, para. 1876 (h).

1. This form should be used by the Executive Engineer in any o the following cases :—

(a).—When he requires a grant or an addition to an existing grant for carrying on a sanctioned major work.

(b).—When he is unable to utilize the grant at his disposal for any work, and wishes to resign it either wholly or in part.

(c).—When he wishes to utilize the grant for one work upon some other.

2. Either of the columns for "Proposed new grant" or for "Proposed reduction," or both, may be used as required.

3. If it appears that the grant already allowed has been reduced, the entry in the column "Existing grant for current year" would of course be the amount less such reduction.

4. In the case of Irrigation works, the entries in the column "Departmental and service head" should show distinctly whether the proposed re-appropriation is debitable to Capital or Revenue, and the entries in the column "Works" should be so arranged as to show the project to the Capital or Revenue account of which the charge is debitable, and the class of service to which the charge is debitable thus :—

____________PROJECT.

(1).—Head works—

(K). Land

(B). Building

In cases of productive public works, the fact of their being so should be noted against the entries.

5. It being of the utmost importance that early intimation of possible lapses, or of excesses in outlay on works should be communicated to the Government, a close watch should be maintained on the progress of all works by Executive Officers, and this form employed the moment the facts are sufficiently known.

6. Applications for re-appropriations which require the sanction of the Government of India should be submitted by the local Government in duplicate ; applications by Executive Engineers should be submitted through the Superintending Engineers of their Circles.

Madras PROVINCE.

BRANCH— ~~Irrigation.~~ B&R

CIRCLE— 7

DIVISION— North Arcot & Cauvery

FUND— 49 Capital

Application for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

*No.*________*dated the*__________*191*

*No.*________*dated the*__________*191*

Urgent

Mr. S Row

Please put up papers & return the circular at once

Sd)
7-9-14

7/9

Gulab Singh & Sons, Calcutta—No. 52 P. W. D.—24-9-12—14,000.

P. W. D. Form No. 41H. P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

~~Fort~~, Madras

10

Application to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for a re-appropriation of Budget grants.

Proposed new grant.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed increase.	Grant as now proposed.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.

Proposed reduction.

Departmental and service head.	Item No. of Budget.	Works.	Amount of estimate.	Outlay to end of previous year.	Original grant for current year.	Existing grant for current year.	Proposed reduction.	Amount at which grant for work will stand after reduction.
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
		Cheyar Anicut System.						
		North Arcot Division.						
49 Irrigation. Haz V	109	Forming Indlagiripathu and Kadagampundi Tanks into one G.O. No. 332-I, dated 12-6-1913	14000	-	5000	5000	(1) 5000	..
	107	Constructing a by-work in the left flood bank of Cheyar Anicut.	18000		8000	8000	(2) ~~3000~~ 5000	5000
		Cauvery Delta System.						
		Cauvery Division.						
	116	Improvements to the Cauvery Vennar Regulator.			10000	10000	(3) 10000	..
	118	Improvements to the Cauvery from the bridge to the Sea.			20000	4110	(4) 4110	..
Haz V	117	Improvements to Vallapalam Pipe[illegible] G.O. No. 596-I, dated 24-10-13 Circle Regr No. 275 of 1913-14	53000	-	20000	20000	(5) 2000	18000
Haz V	114	Improvements to the leading Channel of the Rangayan Head Sluice on the left bank of the Cauvery. G.O. No. 155-I, d/7-3-13 and Circle Regr No. 299/7-3-1913.	2370	-	1370	2370	(6) 700	1670
							18810	
							24,810	

Orders by the Government of ______

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 637 dated the 3rd September 1914.

(OTO)

(Signature) J V Ra[illegible]

Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

Secy. to Govt. of ______ P. W. Department.

No. ______ dated the ______ 191 .

P. W. D. Form No. 41H.

EXPLANATION OF NECESSITY FOR RE-APPROPRIATION.

11

Item (1). The revised estimate received from the Executive Engineer, North Arcot Division, has been returned to him with remarks in No. 680-N.A., dated 22nd July 1914, and there seems to be no probability of its being sanctioned in time to admit of any work being done ~~with~~ this official year. The grant has, therefore, been proposed for surrender.

flag P

Item (2). The estimate having been sanctioned only in G.O. No. 300-I., dated 24th June 1914, the Executive Engineer hopes to spend only Rs. 5,000 this year. The balance has -- therefore been proposed for surrender.

Item (3). The estimate submitted with this office No. 225-E.I., dated 3rd April 1914 and 210-E.I., dated 31st March 1914 respectively is not yet sanctioned. The Executive Engineer reports that it is not possible to do any work before the close of this official year. The grants have, therefore, been proposed for surrender.

Item (4). Fresh levels have to be taken and a subordinate has been sanctioned for the purpose. It is not likely that the estimate will be sanctioned before the end of the current official year. The balance of grant is, therefore, proposed for surrender.

flag Q

Item (5). The land, the draft notification for the acquisition of which was approved in G.O. No. R. 192-I., dated 3rd April 1914, is reported to have been just handed over. The Executive Engineer, after reserving sufficient amount for land compensation and for work that can possibly be done during the year, has proposed a surrender of Rs.2,000 and it is recommended.

flag V

Item (6). The draft notification for the acquisition of land was approved in G.O. R. No. 137-I., dated 9th March 1914. The Collector was addressed by the Executive Engineer to hand over the land at once and was also addressed by this office. The Executive Engineer reports that he also reminded him. The land has not yet been handed over. The amount required for meeting land compensation only has been reserved and the balance is surrendered.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE No. 372 ED 5 SEP 1914 CIRCLE

12

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation Branch.

REMINDER. on 4562/14

To

The Supdg: Engineer
V Circle

THE undersigned has the honour to invite attention to the ~~Order~~ ~~R.O.C.~~ Memo* No. 4562/14-I dated 12-8-14 and to request that this reminder may be returned at once with information in the margin as to—

(1) the stage at which the matter now is,

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, ~~and~~

~~(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.~~

P.K. Subbarayar
4-9-14

MADRAS,
4th September 1914.

for Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

* Subject.

Surrender of Rs 5,000 (proposed) under "49" from the grant for "Impts: to Uyyalakalva and its distributary channels" —
Requesting to state whether the — includes land compensation charges

REPLY.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 9 SEP 1914 320 E.I 8.9.14

To

THE CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION,
Madras.

Reply drafted & will be despatched tomorrow

Received - Vide ... 13 to 15 ...

7-9-14

Supdg Engineer
V Circle

7/9/14

13

C.F.—31.

PUBLIC WORKS **DEPARTMENT.**

C4563/14

CHIEF ENGINEER IRRIGATION.
0 SEP 1914
No. 5637/14-B

Received ....191 . Registered ....191 .

Subject.

Surrender of Rs5000/ from the grant of Uyyalakalva.
Informs that the — does not include land compensation charges.

ENCLOSURES.
No. 1. Copy of letter.
Spare copies

No. 322 E.I.

Station CHEPAUK, Dated the 9 September 1914. 191

From (Name) A.H. Morin Esq.,

(Designation) Supg. Engineer, V Circle, Madras.

To The Chief Engineer for Irrigation,

Madras.

Sir,

p 3 of cf

p 15 of cf

pp 1-2 of cf

With reference to your Memo. No.4562/14-B/1, dated the 18th Aug. 1914, I have the honour to enclose herewith a copy of letter No.575 S.E., dated the 3rd September 1914 from the Executive Engineer, Nellore Division, and to state that the amount of Rs.5,000 surrendered in this office No.268 E.I., dated the 4th Aug. 1914 does not include land compensation charges.

2. As the estimate was submitted for sanction with his No.248/S.E., dated the 7th June 1914, the Executive Engineer did not then expect to surrender any amount in as much as he awaited early sanction, but now he anticipates some delay in procuring information regarding land from the revenue Department and is not sure of spending the balance of grant if the

estimate

is not sanctioned in time.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[signature] 8.9.14

Supg. Engineer, V Circle.

8/9/14.

15

Public Works Department.

Copy of letter No.575 S.E., dated the 3rd September 1914, from A.R. de Chazal, Esq., Executive Engineer, Nellore Division, to the Supg. Engineer, V Circle, M a d r a s.

With reference to your No.586 N.L., dated 18-8-1914, I have the honour to state that the amount of Rs.5,000 proposed for surrender in this office No.441 S.E., dated 28-7-1914 does not include any charges for land. The amount was proposed for surrender as per orders contained in Supg. Engineer's No.1179 G dated 14-7-1914 as the estimate has not yet been received sanctioned if it is not sanctioned soon the remainder of the grant will be surrendered.

2. I do not understand the second para of Chief Engineer's (for Irrigation) letter, this work is new in fact it has not bee begun mention of it was made in the statement of incomplete works.

x The statement is also intended to include "new works".
[signature] 9.9.14

[signature] 8/9/14

(x) No mention was made in the statement rec— from the S.E.
[signature] 9.9.14

V.E.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

Tabling Abstract.

Modifications of grants under the head "49"

Sanctioning certain — with remarks.

Cross References.

7 ends.

Read the following:—

1-2 cf	From the Supg. Engineer V Circle	No. 268 E.I.	dated 4-8-1914
3	To -do-	4562/14-B-1,	dated 12-8-14
4-6	From VI Circle	1204 C.E.	dated 28-8-1914
7-8	From I "	594 C,	dated 2-9-1914
9-11	From VII	637 E.I.	dated 4-9-1914
12	From V	320 E.I.	dated 8-9-14 (reply to reminder, d/4-9-14)
13-15	From V	322 E.I.,	dated 9-9-1914.

Circulated to

Print statement also

Print Notes

1 - 15 cf

ORDER—No. 508 I, dated 9-10-

Press.

The papers read above relate to certain modifications of grants under the head "49 Capital expenditure not charged to revenue" which are consolidated in the appended statement. The reasons for the modifications are explained in the remarks column of the statement. The surrenders proposed

To accept three P.
9-10-14

36

amount to Rs 62,514 as shown in Col.5 of the appendix. After a demand -- amounting to Rs 12,514 is met from these surrenders, there is a balance of Rs 50,000, which will be kept in reserve, pending decision of the question of the head of account to which the re-construction of the Bezwada Headsluice and river wall is chargeable, which is separately under consideration.

[illegible] 25-9-1914 [illegible] 3/9/14 [illegible] 25/9/14

S.C. desp[illegible] 5/11/14

To the Chief Engr.for Irrgn.
" Supg.Engrs.I,V,VI & VII Circles
" Acct.Genl.Madras
" Financial Dept.

[illegible] with statements

2nd E.T

DESPATCHED
Date 9.10.14
Enclos. 1 statement in 4 sheets

3